

Serial No.: 10/607,740

REMARKS

I. Status Summary

Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. No claims have been amended or canceled. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-31 will be pending. Reconsideration of the application based on the arguments set forth hereinbelow is respectfully requested.

II. Request for Telephone Examiner Interview

Applicants hereby request a Telephone Examiner Interview when the Examiner receives and begins consideration of this response. The Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative, Gregory A. Hunt, at 919-493-8000 to schedule the Telephone Examiner Interview.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,683,881 to Mijares et al. (hereinafter, "Mijares") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,279 to Kalmanek, Jr. et al. (hereinafter, "Kalmanek"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for redirecting messages of different SS7 protocol variations. The method includes determining whether a received SS7 message requires redirection. In response to determining that the message requires redirection, the SS7 protocol variation of the message is identified. For example,

Serial No.: 10/607,740

STP **200** can receive SS7 messages from three different types of networks and identify the SS7 protocol variations of the messages. (See page 6, line 23, to page 7, line 4, of the present specification.) In this example, messages of varying SS7 protocol variations can be received from ANSI SS7 network **204**, ITU-I network **206**, and ITU-N network **208**. (See page 6, lines 22 and 23, of the present specification.) As described in the background of the subject application, different variations of the SS7 protocol may be utilized by different networks. (See page 1, lines 18-21, of the present specification.)

Further, claim 1 requires that the received SS7 message is encapsulated in a signaling message control part (SCCP) message. (See e.g., page 7, lines 19-21, of the present specification.) Claim 1 also requires that the SCCP message includes an indicator identifying the SS7 protocol variation of the received SS7 message. (See e.g., page 7, line 22, to page 8, line 7, of the present specification.) The SCCP message is sent to an application and, at the application, the indicator is used for processing the encapsulated SS7 message. (See e.g., page 8, lines 8-13, of the present specification.)

The Examiner contends that Mijares teaches a method for implementing messages of different SS7 protocol variations at column 6, lines 66 and 67, and Figure 5. (Official Action, page 2.) Applicants respectfully submit that there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Mijares of identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message, as required by claim 1. In particular, referring to column 6, line 6, to column 7 line 2, and Figure 5 of Mijares, the reference teaches an

Serial No.: 10/607,740

SS7 protocol stack composed of a set of communication protocols that allow application or processes to communicate with one another over a network. This particular variation of the SS7 protocol described by Mijares is an ANSI SS7 protocol. Mijares merely teaches different protocols of an ANSI SS7 protocol stack. Further, Mijares merely mentions the ITU SS7 protocol at lines 57-60 of column 15. In contrast, claim 1 recites identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message. The SS7 protocol variation recited by claim 1 can be one of several SS7 protocol variations such as ANSI SS7 network, ITU-I network, and ITU-N network. Mijares fails to teach or suggest identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message, as required by claim 1. The mere mention of different SS7 protocol variations is not the same as identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message.

Further, the Examiner contends that Mijares teaches encapsulating a received SS7 message including an indicator identifying the received SS7 message at column 7, line 64, to column 8, line 24. (Official Action, page 2.) Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Mijares of encapsulating a received SS7 message in a signaling message control part (SCCP) message including an indicator identifying the SS7 protocol variation of the received SS7 message, as required by claim 1. Mijares teaches utilizing the SCCP protocol to transport TCAP messages including addressing data for delivering application data to a specified destination. (See column 7, line 64, to column 8, line 1, of Mijares.) The addressing information includes the calling party address and the called party address. (See column 8, lines 3-5, of Mijares.) Applicants respectfully submit that there is

Serial No.: 10/607,740

absolutely no teaching or suggestion of encapsulating a received SS7 message in an SCCP message including an indicator identifying the SS7 protocol variation of a received SS7 message. Moreover, as stated above, there is no absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Mijares of different SS7 protocol variations, such as ANSI, ITU-N, and ITU-I.

Kalmanek likewise fails to teach or suggest identifying the SS7 protocol variation of a received SS7 message; and encapsulating the received SS7 message in an SCCP message including an indicator identifying the SS7 protocol variation of the received SS7 message. Regarding Kalmanek, the Examiner contends that Kalmanek teaches “identifying the received SS7 message” at column 22, lines 41-43; sending a REDIRECT message to gateway controller to direct the call to a destination at column 23, lines 9-11; and encapsulating and coding the message at column 22, lines 50-53. (Official Action, pages 2 and 3.) Referring to column 22, lines 41-43, of Kalmanek, a Call Reference Value is assigned by a remote endpoint to identify all messages associated with the conversation. The call reference value is used to correlate messages associated with the same call and has nothing to do with the SS7 protocol variation. Further with regard to “identifying the received SS7 message,” the Official Action ignores the fact that claim 1 recites, “identifying the SS7 protocol variation of the message,” i.e., whether the message is an ANSI-SS7, ITU-I SS7 or ITU-N SS7 message. Nowhere in Kalmanek is there any teaching or suggestion of identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received SS7 message, as required by claim 1. Further, nowhere in Mijares or Kalmanek is there a teaching or

Serial No.: 10/607,740

suggestion of encapsulating a received SS7 message in an SCCP packet including an indicator identifying the SS7 protocol variation of the received SS7 message, as required by claim 1. Mijares is directed to encapsulating SS7 messages in IP packets. None of the parameters in the IP packets identify the S7 protocol variation of the encapsulated SS7 message. Kalmanek does not mention any encapsulation, not to mention SCCP encapsulation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combined disclosures of Mijares and Kalmanek fail to teach the subject matter recited by claim 1. Further, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed at this time.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1. Therefore, the comments presented above relating to claim 1 apply equally to claims 2-11. Thus, claims 2-11 are believed to be patentably distinguished over Mijares and Kalmanek. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed at this time.

Claim 12 is directed to a method for redirecting messages of different SS7 protocol variations. Similar to claim 1, the method of claim 12 requires (1) identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message; and (2) encapsulating the received SS7 message in an SCCP message having an SS7 protocol variation corresponding to the identified protocol variation. As stated above, the combined disclosures of Mijares and Kalmanek fail to teach or suggest these features. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed at this time.

Serial No.: 10/607,740

Claims 13-22 depend from claim 12. Therefore, the comments presented above relating to claim 12 apply equally to claims 13-22. Thus, claims 13-22 are believed to be patentably distinguished over Mijares and Kalmanek. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed at this time.

Claim 23 is directed to a signaling message routing node for identifying and redirecting messages of different SS7 protocol variations. Similar to claim 1, claim 23 requires (1) identifying an SS7 protocol variation of received messages; (2) encapsulating the received SS7 message in an SCCP message; and (3) indicating the protocol variation of the encapsulated messages. As stated above, the combined disclosures of Mijares and Kalmanek fail to teach or suggest the feature of identifying an SS7 protocol variation of a received message, or an encapsulated message indicating an SS7 protocol variation. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claim allowed at this time.

Claims 24-31 depend from claim 23. Therefore, the comments presented above relating to claim 23 apply equally to claims 24-31. Thus, claims 24-31 are believed to be patentably distinguished over Mijares and Kalmanek. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 24-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed at this time.

Serial No.: 10/607,740

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 50-0426.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON & TAYLOR, P.A.

Date: 7-1-05

By:



Gregory A. Hunt
Registration No. 41,085

1322/144 GAH/BJO/cab

Customer No: 25297